Quid Novi

VOL. IX NO.7

McGILL UNIVERSITY FACULTY OF LAW
FACULTE DE DROIT DE L'UNIVERSITE McGILL

November 1st, 1988
le 1 novembre, 1988

Supreme Court Judge Warns of Workload Crisis

by Kirk Makin
from The Globe and Mail, October 24/88

Canadian judges have lost their focus, are overwhelmed by their workloads and labor under antiquated conditions, a member of the Supreme Court of Canada said yesterday.

"Some judges in some jurisdictions labor virtually alone with little or no support staff and they labor in conditions that Charles Dickens would have felt at home in," Madam Justice Claire L'Heureux-Dubé told a national conference of judges yesterday. "Somewhere during the last 30 years or so something has gone terribly off course. The judiciary has lost its focus."

'It is not overstating the case to say that the present system is overburdened, at times overcriticized and underfunded," said Judge L'Heureux-Dubé, who was appointed to the Supreme Court in April, 1987. "The judiciary is an easy target for every manner of lobbyist, disgruntled advocate or politician on the make."

Canadian courts are buckling under the strain of cases which ought not to be in court at all, or could have been settled in other ways, she said, adding that only a massive public relations exercise including speaking engagements by judges and public relations staff, can awaken the public to the crisis.

She said that judges no longer have time to reflect, remain informed of legal developments, or maintain even a semblance of a normal life. "We are running just as fast as we can to keep from being smothered under the caseloads."

The process of repairing the dilapidated system must begin with judges abandoning their blackrobed mystique and loudly telling the public that they are mere mortals, breaking under a monstrous load, she said. "We must be prepared to provide parliamentarians with guidelines.. We are fairly certain in our own minds which areas of private and public law can be shifted to alternate forums....

"We cannot simply grumble along from day to day, wondering to ourselves how long we can take it before we crack under the burden, are reduced to grouches or chuck the whole thing to find new happiness as bartenders on a cruise ship."

In an age of huckersterism and slick hype, she said, talk of image-changing may seem unworthy. "But perhaps we could use a little work on our images... I believe that too many people see judges -see us - as being akin to minor deities, or the reverse. We must dispel that notion. It is not healthy for people to believe that anyone has special access to truth."

This gulf in public perception leaves people unable to identify with their judges, she said, who are seen as callous, austere and humorless. Yet the opposite is true.

During Judge L'Heureux-Dubé's 15 years in the Quebec Superior Court and the Quebec Court of Appeal, she encountered many warm, generous, dedicated judges, she said. "Would the entire system of justice be put in jeopardy if somehow judges wore their humanity a little more prominently? I don't think so. "

Why must judges be expected to bear the full weight of the litigation explosion in Canada? she asked. "Judges are people...

cont'd on p.4

Quote of the Week

"I just got back from an interesting trial. It was a sexual assault. That's all I seem to be doing these days.... Uhh...'trials', I mean."

Prof. T. Walsh,
Trial Advocacy.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Delta Theta Phi Movie Night
Thursday, November 10, 1988
Starting at 7:30 p.m., in the lounge.

Please vote for the two films which you want to see. Ballots must be returned to S.A.O. by 12:00 noon, Friday the 4th of November.

The Yearbook:
They're Your Memories

by Ali T. Argun, LL. B. IV

Years from now, when you'll be inundated with work, your kids will be screaming, your spouse will complain that you're rarely about and your pet will mess somewhere, your "Bimmer" or Audi will be in the shop, the plumbing in your condo will be leaking. Inevitably, you will ask the question! "What ever happened to the good 'ole days?"

So, next you'll start daydreaming, trying to recall those past events of your youth: your times in Old and/or New Chancellor Day Hall, the library and games room (for you Wotans!). You will, of course , be shocked at how poorly you remember details, names, faces and events that you participated in, groups that you belonged to, and so on.

Well, fortunately for you, there is something that can alleviate the stress you will naturally feel at such a dire moment! Believe it or not, there is a publication designed specifically for such a task... and we now have it at the Faculty. Yes, for a small contribution of time and effort, you too can have the luxury of a YEARBOOK.

In 1987, the Law Faculty, through the hard work and dedication of its very first yearbook committee in history, was graced with the birth of its favorite annual publication. Step aside S.C.R.s , C.A.s and C.S.s. Move over Canadian Abridgements! The big gun is here!!!

This year, the committee is back! And we have great plans. Hopes and desires so grandiose that even the most able dreamer couldn't match them. In the spring, the second generation will be born. It will be either a semi-hard or hard cover edition. It will consist of more pages, chock full of more photos of more people, events and organizations. It'll have samples of artwork, and literature produced by the students and profs. It'll show off the dual cultural heritage that is present here at the faculty (so come on Francophones and Francophiles.) It'll attest to the truly national character of our student body and professorial staff!! All kinds of good things. And it will be all yours!

To accomplish all this, the yearbook committee needs your help. Many people are required for various tasks. We need people to help in our fundraising drive, photography and/or darkroom work, layout, general editorial work, and many other things which are critical but have been forgotten at the moment of writing.

If you're interested, and you should be because this is YOUR YEARBOOK, please come to the meetings that you will find announced in the Quid. If you can't make those sessions, please contact either Karen Amaron or Ali Argun.

If this article sounds like a plea for help, good! It is! If it doesn't sound like it, pretend it does. We can't do it alone. Come on people, it's your yearbook. They're your memories! They're your laughs and good times! You will smile ten years from now as you look back. Help make it a success — give some of your time.

Note to Students

"I know law student have a busy schedule and only have a precious short time to gobble down their lunches before they're off to the library or back to class. But is that any excuse for them to leave the 'refuse' of their lunch on the table? How much time and effort can it possibly take to deposit one's garbage into the container located between the two tables? The 'Pit area' is dreary and depressing enough without having to sit amongst the wasted remains of others' half-eaten lunches.

Please show some respect for your fellow students and the institution that is providing you with a great education!"

-unsigned

Editor's note: A modest proposal which we can all try to implement. Please sign your submissions, especially the good ones.

The Glorious Past
Roman Law as We Never Learned It

by Norbert Haensel

Following are less well-known excerpts from the Institutes and Digests of Justinian.

THE ROMANS WERE A COMPASSIONATE PEOPLE...

Pregnant women cannot be tortured, or condemned to death, until after they have delivered.

Women shall not during a funeral lacerate their faces, or tear their cheeks with their nails; nor shall they utter loud cries bewailing the dead.

A body, after it has been permanently buried and solemn sacrifices have been made, can be transferred by night to another place on account of the overflow of a river, or the fear of impending ruin.

When a person, in any way, causes an injury to another which is not serious, he shall be punished with a fine of twenty asses.

...AND SOMETIMES THEY WERE NOT.

Anyone who gives false testimony shall be hurled from the Tarpeian Rock.

THOSE LATINS DIDN'T SEEM TO LIKE SOME KINDS OF PARTIES.

Persons who celebrate impious or nocturnal rites, so as to enchant, bewitch or bind anyone, shall be crucified or thrown to wild beasts.

ROMAN FAMILY LAW WAS INTERESTING...

Marriage cannot be contracted, but co-habitation can exist between slaves and persons who are free.

An angry husband who surprises his wife in adultery can only kill the adulterer, when he finds him in his own house.

...BUT EVEN MORE SO THEIR CONSUMER PROTECTION LAW.

A slave who has been castrated is not, I think, diseased or defective, but sound; just as one who has but one testicle, who is still capable of reproduction.

A female slave who has her periods twice a month is not healthy. The same rule applies to one who has no such discharge, unless this is due to age.

If anyone should merely assert that a slave has a "peculium", it is sufficient if he has only a very small "peculium".

A left-handed slave is not diseased or defective, unless he uses his left hand more frequently on account of the weakness of his right, but he is not then left-handed, but crippled.

A person whose breath smells is not diseased any more than one who smells like a goat, or who squints; for this may happen to anyone on account of a filthy mouth. However, where this occurs through some bodily defect, for example, from the liver or the lungs, or from any other similar cause, the slave is diseased.

(I wish to dedicate these jewels of law to Prof. David Stevens, whose research requirements lead one to discover knowledge that a conventional legal educational system is hopelessly unprepared to offer.)

Women in the Legal Profession: Reflections on our Past and Future

Women in the Law / Les femmes et le droit

Mercredi le 2 novembre, à 13 hres, Constance Backhouse de la Faculté de droit de l'université de Western Ontario présentera le deuxième séminaire de l'Atelier Annie MacDonald Langstaff. Prof. Backhouse discutera de **l'historique de la pensée féministe en droit.**

Wednesday, November 2, at 1 p.m., Constance Backhouse of the Faculty of Law, University of Western Ontario, will deliver the second presentation in the Annie MacDonald Langstaff Workshop series. Prof. Backhouse will discuss **feminist legal history.**

The history of women in the legal profession is a recent one. Almost one hundred years ago, in 1887, Clara Brett Martin was admitted as a lawyer in Ontario. She was the first woman to be admitted to the practice of law in the British Commonwealth. It was, however, only after World War I that women in England became eligible to join the legal profession and it was not until 1942 that women were admitted as lawyers in Québec. Women were not admitted to many university law schools in the United States until quite recently: Columbia first admitted women law students in 1929, Harvard in 1950 and the University of Notre Dame in 1969.

L'arrivée des femmes dans la pratique du droit est un phénomène récent. Il y a presque cent ans, en 1887 que Clara Brett Martin fut admise comme avocate en Ontario. Elle fut la première femme à être admise à la pratique du droit dans l'empire britannique. Ce ne fut pourtant pas avant la fin de la première guerre

cont'd on p. 6

Quid Novi is published weekly by students at the Faculty of Law of McGill University, 3644 Peel Street, Montreal, H3A 1W9. Production is made possible by support of the Dean's office and by direct funding from the students. Opinions expressed are those of the author only. Contributions are published at the discretion of the editor and must indicate author or origin.

Editor-in-chief / Rédactrice-en-chef: Jeanne Cadorette

Associate Editor / Rédacteur adjoint: Ron Lauenstein

English Editor / Rédacteur anglais: Dan Urbas

French Editor / Rédactrice française: Danielle Lavoie

Production Manager / Directeur de gestion: Alessandra Massobrio

Treasurer / Trésorier: Normand Perreault

Contributors / Participants: Patricia Armstrong, Mayo Moran, Phillip Pike

Quid Novi est une publication hebdomadaire assurée par les étudiants de la faculté de droit de l'université McGill, 3644 rue Peel, Montréal, H3A 1W9. La publication est rendue possible grâce à l'appui du bureau du doyen, ainsi que par le financement individuel des étudiants. Les opinions exprimées sont propres à l'auteur. Toute contribution n'est publiée qu'à la discrétion du comité de rédaction et doit indiquer l'auteur où son origine.

Calendar of Events

November 1988

Nov. 2 12h00 Opportunities for French-speaking common lawyers in the federal Department of Justice
Ms. Anne-Marie Traha (sous-ministre associée, Ministère de la Justice, Ottawa)

Nov. 2 13h00 Annie Macdonald Langstaff Workshop
Feminist Legal Theory: Clara Brett Martin
Constance Dackhouse (Univ. of Western Ontario)

Nov. 3 15h00-18h00 Happy House Coffee Hour
Common Room

Nov. 4 12h00 "Feminism and Community"
Donna Greschner (Saskatchewan)

Nov. 9 12h00 Small Law Firms and Solo Practice
Mr. Tom McKenna (formerly of Stewart, McKenna)
Room 202, Chancellor Day Hall
(to be confirmed)

Nov. 10 15h00-18h00 Happy House Coffee Hour
Common Room

Nov. 11 12h00 Legal Theory Workshop
Jules Coleman (Yale)

Hear ye! Hear ye! Professors, clubs and committees of this faculty. If you are planning other events, please submit the dates and names of the speakers so we can include them in the calendars of events.

Supreme Court Judge
cont'd from p. 1

They fear burnout, and sometimes those fears are justified. Judges are all working under incredibly strained conditions, virtually alone."

Judge L'Heureux-Dubé's speech was made to about 150 judges at a luncheon meeting at the convention. The audience included Chief Justice of Canada Brian Dickson, Madame Justice Bertha Wilson of the Supreme Court of Canada, and the chief justices of Quebec, Ontario and Nova Scotia.

Judge L'Heureux-Dubé said her criticism of the system pertain to all levels of court except her own, since the Supreme Court of Canada has an entirely different administrative structure. After the speech, many judges came up to thank her, and in an interview, Mr. Justice Joseph Potts of the Supreme Court of Ontario said her words rang true for most judges. "I think she probably expressed the common denominator," he said.

Specifically, Judge L'Heureux-Dubé said that many private disputes that litter court lists could be settled through mediation or arbitration. She said that courthouses and court libraries have yet to enter the age of instant communications. "As a result, most judges have practically no time left to do

cont'd on p.6

Highlighters

by Norm de Plume

At a recent book launching of *Zino: The Man and the Law, Volume 2: The Early Years*, I found myself deluged by swarms of highlighter groupies, all of whom it seems had been sniffing their highlighted civil codes too closely. Over and over again, each of these glossy-eyed, nocturnal creatures asked me the same question: "What kind of highlighter should I be using?" Little did they know that the very same question has been reverberating in our hallowed (hollowed?) halls since time immemorial -1972, when highlighters were invented.

There is only one hard and fast rule to which all must adhere. Sadly, each year thousands of students stray and decide to use those darned *fluorescent* highlighters anyway. Innocently lured, no one tells them that "a highlighter is like heroin; once you've had it, you can't stop." Pretty soon, you find yourself in highlighting everything, from menus in restaurants to your voting ballot. Highlighting legal material, unfortunately, turns these seemingly harmless pens into mechanisms of destruction. The smell alone is capable of destroying millions of healthy brain cells per-day, exacerbated with prolonged exposure. Sure, you may laugh, but did your G.P.A. drop in you first year of law school? Think about it. Think about walking around in your 50's, muttering about contingent remainders yet not knowing why or perhaps screaming aloud everytime you hear the name Shelley. Not a pretty picture, is it?

Luckily, some of these poor souls do survive. With the proper rehabilitation, many actually achieve productive and (dare I say?) brilliantly illuminating careers. Unfortunately, modern medicine cannot work miracles. For the rest of their natural lives (in being) plus a period of twenty-one years (60, if you're from Prince Edward Island), these pitiful individuals will have no legal opinions. They will be fortunate in this respect as this will not ostracize them from a majority of their class mates. Until next time, this is Norm de Plume, highlighting off!

Women in law
cont'd from p.3

mondiale que les femmes en Angleterre furent admises dans la profession et au Québec les femmes n'y furent admises qu'en 1942. Dan plusieurs universités américaines, l'admission des femmes en droit est un phénomène récent: Columbia admit les premières femmes en 1929, Harvard en 1950 et l'université de Notre Dame, en 1969.

Women's present position in the profession has been deeply affected by the history of their admission as lawyers. When women began to challenge the male exclusivity of the profession, the reason given for their exclusion
was that women were different from men. The only response open to women was that they were not different from men in any aspect relevant to being a lawyer. Although such reasoning allowed them to gain access to the profession, it confirmed for both men and women that the definition of "lawyer" is male and that women who choose to become lawyers must conform to the male standard.

If the definition of a "successful lawyer"
cont'd on p.8

The Final Arbiter

Part III

This week we present the third in a series of five excerpts from *Judges* by Jack Batten (Toronto: Macmillan of Canada, 1986).

A group of justices fairly regarded as liberal in outlook asserted themselves in the court's deliberations of the late 1940s and early 1950s. Ivan Rand was their pivot, a flinty upright man whose sense of social justice proved to be a formidable instrument. It met its major test when the court was asked to consider a series of legislative bills passed by the Quebec government under Maurice Duplessis. The bills took dead aim at the Jehovah's Witnesses, attempting to interfere with their civil liberties and, incidentally, with the civil liberties of other groups who happened to find themselves caught in the same net. There were seven bills in all, restrictive in intent and in result, and, with Rand leading the way, the Supreme Court overturned each one.

That was the good news.

The bad news was that the court split into two or three different groups in deciding why each of the Duplessis bills should be declared improper and how civil liberties should be upheld. The confusion was understandable; the *BNA Act* offered no guidance on the matter of individual rights, and Canada as yet possessed no Bill of Rights which might establish standards of personal liberty. The court was on its own, and it didn't back away from its lonely challenge. It stood up for civil liberties, even if it wasn't united in stating the specific bases for its stand, and it showed no reluctance in taking a brand-new activist position.

Change came to the court in the 1960s. The liberal Rand reached the newly mandatory retirement age of seventy-five in 1959, and other experienced, clear-headed judges left the court for one reason or another around the same period. James Estey of Saskatchewan died in 1956. Roy Kellock of Ontario retired in 1958, only sixty-four years old but apparently at odds with the Chief Justice, Patrick Kerwin, and possibly anxious to return to the bar,, where he could - and did- earn a good fee as counsel. Charles Locke of Vancouver followed Kellock's example and quit the bench in 1962 to get back to a barrister's work. With the departure of these men the court took on a variation in feel and style.

Throughout the 1960s, it was more conservative than in the 1950s, just as intelligent and rather less predictable. Part of the explanation for its drifting nature was that nobody lasted long enough in the chief justice's chair to push the court in a particular direction. When Patrick Kerwin retired as chief justice in 1963, Robert Taschereau was appointed to the post. Bright and experienced as he was - he had arrived on the court in 1940 - he suffered from a serious drinking problem. He stepped aside in 1967 and John Cartwright took over. Cartwright was all good things in a man of the law, scholarly , courteous, the product of an Ontario establishment background who, *noblesse oblige*, became an unfailing champion of the ordinary citizen. But he had reached an advanced age when he arrived as chief justice and retired after only two and a half years. He was succeeded by Gerald Fauteux, also learned and a veteran of the court but a man who lacked the personality and intellectual vigour to assist his fellow judges along any specific route.

During this period of waffling at the top, the Supreme Court still produced many significant judgments in the private law area. Cartwright, all by himself, accounted for several decisions that gave assurance to counsel and the lower courts. But in one essential, the court of the 1960s proved a disappointment. That let-down revolved around the Bill of Rights. John Diefenbaker guided the Bill through Parliament, a proud document and many others expected to become the vehicle that would expand civil liberties in the country. The Supreme Court took a look at the Bill of Rights and , alas, couldn't make much out of it.

cont'd on p.7

Supreme Court Judge
cont'd from p.4

what judges do best: to determine and apply broad legal principles... Now is the time for quality, not quantity. What I am sure of is that something is required and required now. Who better to begin the process than us?"

The judge proposed a media representative in every appellate court to help the journalists "wade throught the cases and judgments."

She said there should also be a judicial "ambassador's" office with well-versed staff available to go to school, service clubs and government departments to speak about courts and the judiciary. Judges themselves should also be prepared to undertake these engagements.

At one point in her speech, Judge L'Heureux-Dubé spoke of the burden on Supreme Court of Canada judges as they watch the rising torrent of appeals involving public policy question, for which they are the court of last resort.

"By training and consequently, by disposition, we are inclined to approach the issues before us narrowly and conservatively," she said. "Those who would have us assume a greater role in national policy formulation, however, urge us to adopt a more expansive approach. Are public expectations too great?

"Judging is tough work... It requires energy and stamina and courage, as well as intellectual ability. It also requires a high degree of sensitivity, pragmatism and awareness of the human condition. All the legal training in the world won't make you a good judge, if you lack compassion. In my opinion, it is far more important to be able to appreciate the plight of the poor than to understand the 'rule in Shelley's case'."

Lessons from Kindergarten

from the Folknife (San Francisco Folk Music Club) Vol. XXIII, No. 5, Sept/Oct, 1987.

submitted by Jay Spare and Marie Lussier

Most of what I really need to know about how to live, and what to do, and how to, I learned in kindergarten. Wisdom was not at the top of the graduate school mountain but here in the sandbox at nursery school.

These are the things I learned: Share everything. Play fair. Don't hit people. Put things back where you found them. Clean up your own mess. Don't take things that aren't yours. Say you're sorry when you hurt somebody. Wash your hands before you eat. Flush. Warm cookies and cold milk are good for you. Live a balanced life. Learn some and think some and draw and paint and sing and dance and play and work every day some. Take a nap every afternoon. When you go out into the world, watch for traffic, hold hand, and stick together. Be aware of wonder. Remember the little seed in the plastic cup. The roots go down and the plant goes up and nobody really knows how or why, but we are all like that.

Goldfish and hamsters and white mice and even the little seed in the plastic cup - they all die. So do we.

And then remember the book about Dick and Jane and the first word you learned, the biggest work of all: LOOK. Everything you need to know is in there somewhere. The Golden Rule and love and basic sanitation. Ecology and politics and sane living.

Think of what a better world it would be if all of us - the whole world - had cookies and milk about 3 o'clock every afternoon and then lay down with our blankets for a nap. Or, if we had a basic policy in our nation and other nations to always put things back where we found them and cleaned up our own messes.

And it is still true, no matter how old you are, when you go out into the world, it is best to hold hands and stick together.

The Final Arbiter
cont'd from p.6

The Bill was passed in 1960, and the first case invoking it reach the Supreme Court in 1963. The case had to do with a humble bowling-alley. Under the Lord's Day Act, a fed statute, the alley was compelled to shut down on Sundays. But the alley's proprietors contended that the new Bill of Rights took precedence over the Lord's Day Act and allowed people like them to observe Sundays in ways that they chose. Their way was to throw open their bowling-alley to customers who hadn't gone to church.

The Supreme Court listened to the argument, and the majority reacted to it nervously and narrowly. The basis of their decision was that, contrary to what Diefenbaker's parliamentarians might have thought, the Bill of Rights created no new rights and freedoms. It merely confirmed rights that existed prior to 1960. Thus, if an earlier piece of federal legislation - The Lord's Day Act in the immediate case - wasn't considered to have interfered with an old right and freedom - freedom of religion in the instance - then the Bill of Rights introduced no new element into the equation. The bowling-alley would have to remain closed on the sabbath as the Lord's Day Act required.

So much for the promised glory of the Bill of Rights.

The one ray of optimism for civil-libertarians came from John Cartwright's lone dissent in the case. He took the activist view and wrote in ringing terms that where a parliamentary statute collided with the Bill of Rights, the statute must yield. That was the sort of approach John Diefebaker, civil rights champions, and bowling-alley proprietors had been hoping for. But, as history later indicated, they couldn't count on the court's following the direction that Cartwright pointed out. They couldn't even count on Cartwright's continuing along in his own direction.

The next major test for the Bill of Rights came in the *Drybones* case of 1970. Joseph Drybones had been drunk one night in Yellowknife, and, since he was an Indian, he found himself charged and convicted under section 94 of the *Indian Act* with "being an Indian intoxicated off a reserve". Drybones, like all native people, was treated differently from other Canadians, from *white* Canadians; the latter, after all, couldn't get convicted of such an arcane crime as being "intoxicated off a reserve". There was one law for Indians and another for the rest of Canada, a situation that seemed to call into play the Bill of Rights.

When the Drybones case climbed to the Supreme Court, the nine judges split six to three, with Roland Ritchie, an independently minded Maritimer, writing the majority judgment. It turned out to be a shining moment for the Bill of Rights, the part of the federal legislation that differed became instantly inoperative. Specifically, in the Drybones matter, section 94 of the *Indian Act*, under which poor drunken Joseph Drybones was convicted, ran head-on into section five of the Bill of Rights, which guaranteed equality for all Canadians before the law. Drybones, an Indian, wasn't treated equally with other Canadians. Therefore, the Indian Act's section 94 was out the window.

Civil-rights proponents celebrated the judgment. but their joy wasn't unconfined. The trouble was that one of the three dissenters in the Drybones case was none other than the hero of the bowling-alley case, John Cartwright. By 1970, he had moved up to the chief justice's job, and in a stunning change of mind, he wrote in his Drybones judgment that he had been badly mistaken in his earlier judgment. Parliament, he concluded, couldn't possibly have meant that the Bill of Rights should make other federal statutes inoperative. It was all too vague, Cartwright said - Parliament's intention, the meaning of the Bill of Rights, the whole muddled package. Cartwrights may have been right. What was undoubtedly certain was that his judg-

Cont'd on p. 8

Women in law
cont'd from p.5

remains unchanged, it matters little whether the number of women in the profesion increases or not. However, if the community recognizes that women have something of their own to contribute, all will be enriched and only then will women be victorious.

La position actuelle des femmes dans la profession reflète les moyens qu'elles durent adopter, historiquement, pour y être admises. En effet, les femmes durent affirmer qu'elles n'étaient pas différentes des hommes quant aux critères requis pour pratiquer de droit. Ce raisonnement leur permit d'accéder à la profession mais confirma, pour les hommes et les femmes, que le concept "d'avocat" est un concept masculin et que les femmes que décident de pratiquer le droit doivent se conformer aux normes établies par leurs confrères.

Si la définition d'un "avocat compétent" demeure inchangée, il importe peu que les femmes occupent de plus en plus de postes au sein de la profession.
Toutefois, si l'on reconnaît que les femmes peuvent apporter une contribution qui leur est propre, notre communauté s'en trouvera enrichie et les femmes pourront enfin se dire victorieuses.
L'article du Prof. Backhouse, "To Open the Way for Others of My Sex: Clara Brett Martin's Career as Canada's First Woman Lawyer" a été mis en réserve, sous "Atelier Annie MacDonald Langstaff" et "Advanced Jurisprudence".

An article by Prof. Backhouse, "To Open the Way for Others of My Sex: Clara Brett Martin's Career as Canada's First Woman Lawyer" is on reserve, under Annie MacDonald Langstaff Workshop Series" and "Advanced Jurisprudence".

The Final Arbiter
cont'd from p. 7

ment in Drybones contributed to the confusion among his fellow justices, and the upshot was that the court was never again able to say much that added strength or meaning to John Diefenbaker's Bill of Rights. "

Quid Novi
Etats financiers

01 sept 1987 au 31 août 1988

Revenus

Contributions des étudiants (469 @ 8$)	$ 3752.00
Party	255.75
Publicité	81.75
Abonnements	114.00
Total: $4203.50	

Dépenses

Imprimeur	3420.87
Dactylographie	967.82
Frais bancaires	99.00
Divers	187.07
Total: 4674.76	

Pertes: ($ 471.26)

Réconciliation

Reliquat (en date du 1 sep 1987)	423.82
(moins) Pertes	471.26
Reliquat au livre (31 août 1988)	($ 47.44)
Reliquat bancaire (31 août 1988)	(67.83)
Plus: Reliquat petite caisse (31 août 1988)	20.39
Reliquat physique	($47.44)

Sports Corner
Le coin des Sportifs

Squash

We need supporters for our valiant squash players at the first Annual McGill-Université de Montréal Legal Squash Tournament to be held at the Rockland Sports Centre on Saturday, November 5, beginning at 12h00.

Venez encourager nos joueurs de squash au premier Omnium juridique de squash McGill-Université de Montréal. Le tournoi aura lieu au Centre Sportif de Rockland, le samedi 5 novembre, à partir de 12h00.

Law Games / Jeux-Ridiques

Places are going quickly. If you would like to go, see your class president.

Les places s'envolent rapidement. Voir votre président(e) de classe.

Contest / Concours

We need a logo or mascot for the Law Games. Put your suggestions in the Athletic Coordinator's box. There will be a prize for the winning entry.

Nous avons besoin d'un logo ou d'une mascotte pour les Jeux-Ridiques. Veuillez soumettre vos suggestions dans la boîte du coordonnateur des sports. Oui, il y aura un prix pour la meilleure suggestion.